Examiner-Initiated Intervi w Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/820,313	TAKAO ET AL.
	Examin r	Art Unit
	Callie E. Shosho	1714
All Participants:	Status of Application	n: <u>Allowed</u>
(1) <u>Callie E. Shosho</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>John Bailey</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 6 January 2005	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ If Yes, provide a brief description:	cant's representative)	
ii Tes, provide a brief description.		:
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 7,9,14 Prior art documents discussed:		·
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GEN See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT	WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. To fit the interview in the Netice of Allowability. Pox + II. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa 	The examiner will provide a こっとしいで、 e record of the substance o	written summary of the substance of the interview, since the interview
	-	*
·		
•		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applica	nt/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The examiner's amendment was agreed to and authorized by Mr. Bailey in order that (i) the recitation of claim 7 has proper antecedent basis, (ii) claim 9 recites proper Markush group, and (iii) it is clear in claim 14 that the silicone graft polymer is "obtained from" an acrylic compound. Support for the amendment to claim 14 is found, for instance, on pages 14-15 of the present specification.